

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01127 011224Z

43

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAM-01 SAJ-01 SS-20 NSC-10 ACDA-19 OMB-01 IO-14 AEC-11

OIC-04 DRC-01 /162 W

----- 080097

R 011030Z MAR 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 4346

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 3754

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T USNATO 1127

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: FORTHCOMING WORK IN NATO

VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR

REF: A. VIENNA 1656 B. USNATO 0865

SUMMARY: APPRECIATE USEFUL MESSAGE (REF A) ON FORTHCOMING WORK IN NATO ON MBFR. I CONSIDER THAT PRESENT DIVISION OF LAGOR BETWEEN COUNCIL AND AD HOC GROUP SEEMS TO SERVE US OBJECTIVES IN MBFR AND HAS HELPED ALLIED NEGOTIATORS IN VIENNA IN THEIR ACHIEVEMENTS TO DATE. IT HAS ALSO HELPED TO FOCUS PRESSURE FROM ALLIES HERE AND KEEP THEM DIVERTED FROM BOTH WASHINGTON AND VIENNA. CERTAIN STEPS COULD BE TAKEN, HOWEVER, TO FURTHER IMPROVE COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN BRUSSELS AND VIENNA, SUCH AS THE FOLLOWING:

-- INCLUSION IN AHG CHAIRMAN'S REPORTS TO THE NAC OF NEGOTIATING SITUATION AND TIME FRAME WITH RESPECT TO ISSUES UNDER STUDY
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 01127 011224Z

IN THE ALLIANCE;

-- POSSIBLE INCLUSION, AS USDEL MBFR SUGGESTS, OF STATUS REPORT ON EASTERN VIEWS IN NATO STUDIES ON SPECIFIC ISSUES.

ACTION REQUESTED: MISSION WOULD APPRECIATE WASHINGTON RESPONSE TO GUIDANCE REQUESTED REF B ON MISSION SENSE OF PRIORITIES IN APPROACHING VARIOUS OUTSTANDING MBFR ISSUES. END SUMMARY.

1. WE WELCOME STATEMENT FROM USDEL SHARING MISSION'S INTEREST IN PRESERVING AS MUCH FLEXIBILITY FOR USG AS POSSIBLE IN MBFR AND IN AVOIDING EXCESSIVE RIGIDITY IN COUNCIL GUIDANCE TO AD HOC GROUP. PRACTICAL EFFECT, HOWEVER, OF US DEL'S SUGGESTION THAT APPROACHES TO VARIOUS NEGOTIATING ISSUES BE WORKED OUT ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS WOULD CALL FOR RE-WRITING THE BASIC FROUND RULES FOR THE DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES BETWEEN THE COUNCIL AND AD HOC GROUP. SYG LUNS AND OTHER PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVES HAVE MADE IT CLEAR THAT THEY CONSIDER THAT PRESENT ARRANGEMENT IS WORKING EVEN BETTER THAN COULD HAVE BEEN EXPECTED, AND SO DO WE.

2. EVEN THOUGH SOME SITUATIONS WALK A FINE LINE BETWEEN POLICY AND TACTICS, OUR EXPERIENCE IS THAT IT HAS PROVEN USEFUL TO ATTEMPT TO MAINTAIN A DIVIDING LINE BETWEEN THE TWO. HARD BARGAINING AMONG ALLIES IN NATO IN DEVELOPING CONSENSUS OF BASIC SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES FREES NEGOTIATORS IN VIENNA TO DEVOTE MORE OF THEIR ATTENTION TO WORKING OUT AGREEMENTS WITH THE EAST--AND HAS PROBABLY SPARED WASHINGTON COUNTLESS DEMARCHES BY NATO EMBASSIES AS WELL. WITH VIENNA'S HELP WE HAVE BEEN ABLE TO AVOID TIME-CONSUMING DISCUSSION HERE ON ALLIES' TACTICAL SUGGESTIONS BY ARGUING THAT TACTICAL QUESTIONS BELONG TO AHG. BY THE SAME TOKEN, USDEL IN VIENNA HAS BEEN ABLE TO PUT OFF UNWELOCME IDEAS BY OTHER ALLIES IN AHG (E.G. ON MEASURES FOR THE FLANKS) BY NOTING THAT THERE HAS BEEN NO ALLIANCE AGREEMENT AS YET ON THOSE SUGGESTIONS, AND TO BRING STRAYING ALLIES INTO LINE BY CITING PREVIOUSLY AGREED NAC GUIDANCE.

3. WITH RESPECT TO USDEL'S COMMENT THAT ISSUES ARE DEALT WITH IN A "MORE ABSTRACT WAY" IN NATO, THIS IS CLEARLY A MATTER OF PERSPECTIVE. WE SHOULD KEEP IN MIND AND FULLY UNDERSTAND THE SOMEWHAT UNIQUE FACT THAT US IS ENGAGED IN TWO NEGOTIATIONS ON MBFR: ONE WITH ITS NATO ALLIES, ANOTHER WITH ITS ADVERSARIES. THE
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 01127 011224Z

FIRST NEGOTIATION CAN INVOLVE SOME CONSIDERATIONS AND ISSUES WHICH APPARENTLY SEEM ABSTRACT FROM THE VIENNA PERSPECTIVE, BUT WHICH ARE VERY REAL FROM THE PERSPECTIVE IN ALLIED CAPITALS. INDEED, IF THE U.S. APPEARS TO BECOME LESS ATTENTIVE TO THE CONCERNS OF ITS ALLIES THAN TO MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE EAST, WE COULD DIMINISH THE SECURITY AND COHESION WE ARE STRIVING TO MAINTAIN AND IMPROVE THROUGH MBFR NEGOTIATIONS.

4. SOMETIMES THESE DISCUSSIONS MAY ALSO INVOLVE A GREATER DEGREE OF DETAIL THAN USDEL MAY CONSIDER NECESSARY IN LIGHT OF NEGOTIATING SITUATION, ALTHOUGH THEY ARE UNDERTAKEN IN RESPONSE TO NATIONAL GUIDANCE. A CERTAIN DEGREE OF DETAIL MAY BE INEVITABLE AS DISCUSSIONS UNFOLD AND MAY BE DESIRABLE, AS LONG AS DISCUSSION

OF DETAIL DOES NOT HOLD UP BASIC GUIDANCE BEYOND THE POINT OF ITS BEING USEFUL AND AS LONG AS IT INVOLVES SUBSTANTIVE AND NOT TACTICAL ELEMENTS OF ALLIED PROPOSALS. WE BELIEVE IT TOO SOON TO JUDGE WHETHER THE ALLIANCE HAS GONE INTO EXCESSIVE DETAIL ON STABILIZING MEASURES OR VERIFICATION. THE SPECIFIC ELEMENTS OF THESE POSITIONS DIRECTLY AFFECT ALLIANCE DEFENSE PLANNING AND ARE POINTS ON WHICH ALLIES AND NATO MILITARY AUTHORITIES WISH TO HAVE CLEAR UNDERSTANDING.

5. AT THE SAME TIME, WE ARE KEENLY AWARE OF THE DRAWBACKS OF HAVING POSITIONS SO TIGHTLY CIRCUMSCRIBED THAT DEVIATION FROM THEM WOULD REQUIRE CONTINUED RECOURSE TO THE COUNCIL. IF SUCH PROBLEMS ARISE, WE WILL HAVE TO HANDLE THEM IN LIGHT OF THE FACTORS AT THAT TIME. AS POINTED OUT IN REF B, HOWEVER, THE COUNCIL THUS FAR HAS SUCCEEDED IN GIVING AHG WIDE LATITUDE IN PURSUING TACTICS, IN DRAFTING STATEMENTS AND IN DRAWING UPON BASIC POSITIONS IN WAYS MOST APPROPRIATE TO FAIN EASTERN ACCEPTANCE.

6. MISSION AGREES WITH USDEL ON THE NEED TO HAVE ALLIES FOCUS ON INDIVIDUAL, SEPARATE POLICY ISSUES. INDEED, THIS IS THE APPROACH WHICH ALLIES IN RESPONSE TO WASHINGTON'S LEAD HAVE FOLLOWED THUS FAR. MISSION'S SUGGESTION THAT ALLIES EVENTUALLY CONSULT ON THE BASIC PROVISIONS OF AN INITIAL MBFR AGREEMENT WAS NEVER INTENDED TO TAKE THE PLACE OF STUDY OF INDIVIDUAL ISSUES. RATHER USNATO WISHED TO FLAG THIS AS A LOGICAL STEP WHICH WASHINGTON MAY WISH ALLIANCE TO TAKE IN ORDER TO EXPEDITE A COUNCIL CONSENSUS AFTER REPEAT AFTER ALLIES HAVE REACHED CONSENSUS OF INDIVIDUAL ELEMENTS OF A POSSIBLE INITIAL AGREEMENT AND AFTER REPEAT AFTER THE

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 01127 011224Z

PATTERN OF NEGOTIATIONS HAS BECOME CLEARER.

7. ESSENTIAL QUESTION IN EXAMINING FORTHCOMING WORK IN NATO IS TO ENSURE THAT THIS WORK IS REALISTICALLY GEARED TO CURRENT AND FUTURE REQUIREMENTS OF NEGOTIATING SITUATIONS. US DEL'S HELPFUL SUGGESTION THAT EACH NATO STUDY OF A SPECIFIC ISSUE CONTAIN A DESCRIPTION PREPARED BY THE AHG OF THE EASTERN POSITION WOULD SERVE THIS END. ANOTHER STEP WOULD BE FOR AHG CHAIRMAN TO INCLUDE IN HIS ORAL REPORT EVERY THREE WEEKS TO THE COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS ON EASTERN POSITION VIS-A-VIS THE SPECIFIC ISSUES WHICH ARE UNDER STUDY IN NATO AND INDICATIONS OF APPROXIMATE TIME FRAME IN WHICH FURTHER GUIDANCE WILL BE REQUIRED. THIS PROCEDURE WOULD ENABLE ALLIES TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT ANY SHIFTS IN EASTERN POSITIONS AND WOULD HELP ENSURE THAT WORK IN NATO IS RESPONSIVE TO ACTUAL NEGOTIATING REQUIREMENTS IN VIENNA. IT WOULD ALSO HELP TO MAKE AHG BRIEFINGS OF THE COUNCIL MORE RELEVANT TO NEEDS OF BOTH COUNCIL AND AD HOC GROUP, AND THEREFORE AT CAPITALS. RUMSFELD.

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 01 MAR 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO01127
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740381/abbrytne.tel
Line Count: 161
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. VIENNA 1656 B. USNATO 0865
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 19 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <19 MAR 2002 by hilburpw>; APPROVED <02 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: FORTHCOMING WORK IN NATO
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

